<div align="center">**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**</div>

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Currently, claims 1 and 3-10 are pending in this application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112:

Claims 1 and 3-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant traverses this rejection.

The Office Action states "The Examiner cannot find support in the specification for content that has been judged by a human to be semantically-related to the content of the first media file." Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, the feature "content has been judged by a human to be semantically-related to the content of the first media file" has been deleted from claim 1. Similar deletion has been made to claim 8. Applicant therefore requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Instead of "content has been judged by a human to be semantically-related to the content of the first media file", claim 1 now requires "where the media file metadata item containing the reference(s) is about a media file which encodes content that has been judged by an editor to be semantically-related to the content encoded by the media file(s) associated with the media file metadata item(s) to which the reference(s) refer". Similar comments apply to claim 8. These features are adequately described by the original specification.

The original specification describes that relationships between media elements might be indicated by a user using a graphical user interface (page 9, lines 27-29). Those relationships properties are included with metadata (page 9, lines 25-27) which is included within a Media Object (page 7, lines 1-2 and page 12 lines 13-14). Media Objects include a pointer to a MORelationship object (page 12, lines 19-20). A MORelationship object has a subclass

MOSequence (page 12, line 24). MOSequence represents a sequence of semantically related objects (page 13, lines 6-8).

Moreover, the "editor" described in the original specification refers to a human (e.g., the editor is referred to as "he" at page 10, line 18 or as a "user" or "him" at page 9, line 27). The original specification describes that relationship data can capture an editor's belief that media elements should be shown in a given order (page 9, lines 31 to 33), or should be shown together (page 10, lines 18-20). The relationship is thus between what the media elements show. The claimed "content" that has been judged by an editor to be semantically-related to the content encoded by the media file(s) associated with the media file metadata item(s) to which the reference(s) refer has an adequate written description in the specification.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103:

Claims 1, 3 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the _three_-way combination of Bernstein et al. (U.S. '726, hereinafter "Bernstein '726") in view of Sheth et al. (U.S. '194, hereinafter "Sheth"), and further in view of Bernstein (U.S. '316, "Bernstein '316"). Claims 8 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the _four_-way combination of Bernstein '726, Sheth and Bernstein '316, and further in view of Ali et al. (U.S. '506, hereinafter "Ali"). Applicant traverses these rejections.

In order to establish a _prima facie_ case of obviousness, all of the claims limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, the three-way combination of Bernstein '726, Bernstein '316 and Sheth fails to teach or suggest "persistent storage memory connectable

to said one or more data processors, said persistent storage memory storing a plurality of media

file metadata items, one or more of said media file metadata items containing reference(s) to one

or more other media file metadata items, where the media file metadata item containing the

reference(s) is about a media file which encodes content that has been judged by an editor to be

semantically-related to the content encoded by the media file(s) associated with the media file

metadata item(s) to which the reference(s) refer," as required by independent claim 1 and its

dependents. The four-way combination of of Bernstein '726, Bernstein '316, Sheth and Ali fails

to teach or suggest "storing a plurality of media file metadata items in said second data store,

together with relationship data comprising reference(s) to one or more related media file

metadata items where one or more of the plurality of media file metadata items stored together

with relationship data comprising the reference(s) is about a media file which encodes content

that has been judged by an editor to be semantically-related to the content encoded by the media

file(s) associated with the media file metadata item(s) to which the reference(s) refer," as

required by independent claim 8 and its dependents.

 Page 4 of the Office Action admits that Bernstein '726 "does not explicitly disclose

'whose metadata is about a media file whose content has been judged by a human to be

semantically-related to the content of the first media file nor a) analyze response media file

metadata items provided in response to said query to find said reference(s) to one or more other

media files metadata items semantically related media file metadata items related to said

response media file metadata items....'" Based on this admission of the Office Action, Bernstein

'726 clearly does not disclose "storing a plurality of media file metadata items, one or more of

said media file metadata items containing reference(s) to one or more other media file metadata

items, where the media file metadata item containing the reference(s) is about a media file

which encodes content that has been judged by an editor to be semantically-related to the content encoded by the media file(s) associated with the media file metadata item(s) to which the reference(s) refer," as required by claim 1. Based on the above admission of the Office Action, Bernstein '726 also does not disclose the above quoted limitation of claim 8.

Sheth does not resolve the above-described deficiencies of Bernstein '726. Instead, Sheth only contemplates relationships between related terms – e.g. a *car* is a *vehicle*. Computers must be taught these relationships in order to be able to draw logical conclusions from files containing text. Such rules are intended to be general rules which a computer might use in automatically reasoning about files it accesses – such rules do not represent relationships between data items noted by a user, let alone relationships between the content encoded by different media files -- as is required by the claims.

Like Bernstein and Sheth, neither Bernstein nor Ali teaches or suggests the above-quoted limitations of claim 1 or 8. In short, none of cited references teach or suggest metadata including one or more reference(s) which capture a semantic relationship between what is portrayed in one media file and what is portrayed in a second media file – as judged by a human editor. In case for example where two media items (e.g., film versions of "The Tempest" and "Othello") are both labelled with the same attribute (e.g., Author = Shakespeare), then while that metadata might show that the two media items are related, it does not follow that the two media items are semantically related, and it certainly does not follow that one includes a reference to the other.

Claims 5 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentanble over the *four*-way combination of Bernstein, Sheth and Bernstein '316, and further in view of Mangat et al. (U.S. '799, previously cited). Claim 9 has been rejected under 35

U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over the _five_-way combination Bernstein, Sheth, Bernstein '316 and Ali, and further in view of Porter et al. (U.S. '737, previously cited).

Each of these claims depends from base independent claim 1 or 8. None of the fourth and/or fifth references (Mangat et al, Ali et al, or Porter et al) cited in these combinations resolve the deficiencies of the three-way or four-way combination with respect to base independent claim 1 or 8, respectively.

For example, paragraph [0074] (specifically identified by page 15 of the Office Action) of Porter merely discloses sorting and grouping media metadata describing the semantics of content into broad categories such as who, what, where and when. For example, a full-text relevancy ranker 80 in Porter's system semantically associates a user-entered term "Mozart" with the who category and thus looks for "Mozart" in a field designated as WhoCreation. Similarly, Porter's full-text relevancy ranker 80 may recognize a user-entered search query term "Magic Flute" as a music composition and semantically associate that term with the what category, and thus looks for it in the title field. However, Porter fails to teach or suggest storing a plurality of media file metadata items in said second data store, together with relationship data comprising reference(s) to one or more related media file metadata items where the media file metadata item containing the reference(s) is about a media file which encodes content that has been judged by an editor to be semantically-related to the content encoded by the media file(s) associated with the media file metadata item(s) to which the reference(s) refer.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

Conclusion:

Applicant believes that this entire application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a notice to this effect. If the Examiner has any questions or believes that an interview would further prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____ /Raymond Y. Mah/ _____
Raymond Y. Mah
Reg. No. 41,426

RYM:dmw
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100